

A Queer Reading of *King Lear*: the Repressed Sodomite Reflections within the Compulsory Heterosexual Text

Bidhan Mondal

M.A. (English), B.ed

Burdwan University, India

*Queer theory demonstrates that even apparently 'straight' text can be opened up to readings that draw on sociological, historical, and psychoanalytic accounts of homosexuality. Elizabethan literature gave rich Elizabethan men a decidedly effeminate appearance to modern eyes. Portraits of young men and women can be hard to tell apart. The sexualisation of boys was entrenched in English urban culture by the theatrical practice of having female roles played by boys and young men. The historically perverted misnomer homosexuality or "sodomy" pulled at something momentous in Shakespeare, something that had important things to say about sexualities and their relationship to history and interpretation. Shakespeare situated his works at the civility that bothered many and broadened social norms. It is something extraordinary, when looked through the lens of queer analysis. Shakespeare, through the same-sex eroticism in his works, especially I have found in *King Lear*, representing the limits of social representation of sexuality in Renaissance/Victorian literature. As in his real life Shakespeare oscillates between heterosexuality and homosexuality, he also makes his play *King**

Lear a pendulum that oscillates between heterosexuality and homosexuality. In fact, in Shakespearean writings all, but a few sexual references are heterosexual in tone, yet vast theories have been built around the exceptions. These are rather codified and ambiguous references to homosexuality or sodomy. Thus *King Lear* was performed at the court with a special mission of combining these two sub-cultural sites----Theatre and the Court. The play depicts a crisis of an institution, centres on an ideal of male masculinity which finds an enabling other, but also a potentially subversive danger in female femininity. These bold displays of absurd sexualities in Shakespeare's works allow them to be read differently in the future, which is to say that they might signify sexualities which were not available during his time. It may help the students and scholars to realise the gender dynamics and power relations in the renaissance dramas and also help them to realise that gender as a whole is not innate but socially constructed.

[**Key Words:** "Heterosexuality", "Homosexuality", "feminisation", "Queer".]

The word “queer” is used to indicate a specific theoretical perspective. From a theoretical point of view, the words ‘gay’ and ‘lesbian’ imply a definable category---homosexuality---that is clearly opposite to definable category heterosexuality. However, for queer theory, categories of sexuality cannot be defined by such simple oppositions as homosexual\heterosexual. Moreover, heterosexuality is not a norm against which homosexuality can be defined because the range of human sexuality cannot be properly understood in terms of such limited concepts as homosexual and heterosexual. These concepts reduce sexuality to the biological sex of one’s partner, or, in psychological terms; one’s object choice. Eve Kosovsky Sedgwick argues:

Queer can refer to the open mesh of possibilities,

Gaps overlaps, dissonances and resonances, lapses and

Excesses of meaning when the constituent elements....are

N’t made to signify monolithically. (Sedgwick 72)

Queer theory emerged during the late 1980s and 1990s, which distinguish the issues of ‘sex’ (male/female), ‘gender’ (masculine/feminine) and ‘sexuality’

(homosexual/heterosexual). The proponents of queer theory point out that the norm is not merely the male, but the heterosexual male. The patriarchal system has marginalised not only the female, but also the homosexual. This marginalisation therefore has both theoretical and political implications in literary studies. Queer theorists tend to point to the unstable nature of sexual identities, and the ways in which cross-dressing, transsexual bodies and gay readings of straight text can subvert the dualistic notions of male and female, gay and straight. More recently Judith Butler, an eminent queer theorist, has sought to question the conventional notion of the body as the ultimate determinant of sexuality. Butler seeks to go beyond the distinction between sex and gender, which presents the former as nature and the latter as a cultural construct:

Gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time

....in an exterior space....through the stylization of

The body.... (Butler 140)

Although the term “sodomite” had different connotations during the renaissance, it did include the practice of homosexuality. However sodomy also included other activities such as bestiality

and gender debauchery. The best way to describe the difference between the sodomite of the renaissance and the homosexual of the 1990s is today the sodomites began to identify themselves as a distinct category which they could not in the renaissance. As the renaissance began, there were prescriptions against sodomy although they were not strongly enforced. In the fourteenth century a variety of anti-sodomy laws were enacted by the north Italian city states. These enactments laid the groundwork for a greater European trend toward secular anti-sodomy legislation in the fifteenth century that associate sodomy with the plague which incurred the wrath of God. Thus a growing awareness and fear of a homosexual subculture, crystallized the perception of sodomites and some of them continued to prefer homosexuality under the guise of heterosexuality. *King Lear* was written at a time when homosexuality or “Sodomy”----was banned. During contemporary period James I, the new king of England, made it clear to his subjects that he was a practising homosexual. He lived apart from his wife and child and lavished gifts on his young male lovers. His court was described as full of “fools, bawds, mimics and catamites”, who engaged in debaucheries. In any given society, ‘sex’ is filtered through the culturally dominant

codes that regulate the behaviour acceptable in men and women. They also determine the social division between the sexes, in the basis of which men and women are placed into “mutually exclusive categories”. This even subjugates homosexuality and privileges heterosexuality. Shakespeare is against that and his play *King Lear* is connected with the court of king James, since the play presented to the king’s court on St. Stephen’s Night, in 1606, a festival that might be counted as an occasion of debaucheries. Like James’s court, London theatre was also the spearhead of homosexual sub-culture of early seventeenth century England. Thus *King Lear* was performed at the court with a special mission of combining these two sub-cultural sites----Theatre and the Court.

It was of course the first volume of Michael Foucault’s *The History of Sexuality* which pointed out the error of seeing the past as either more or less repressed, or more or less liberated, than the present. Foucault’s examination of the last three centuries indicates that in the field of sex and sexualities, one sees a ‘discursive explosion’. Church and state institutions incited a proliferation of discourses concerned with sex and sexuality, and power and knowledge. Refining Foucault’s work, Sedgwick

considers that sexualities have never been clearly defined, marked as they are by haziness, indistinctness, conflict and always been aberrant, queer, lacking any clear definitions. The play begins with a homosexual suggestiveness. In the very first sentence of the play Kent remarks:

I thought the king had more
affected the Duke

Of Albany than Cornwall.
(*King Lear* I.1.1-2)

In this speech Kent draws attention to the relation between the male affection and affairs of the state. The remark hints at the rashness and indecisiveness in Lear that will result in the destruction of the state. The masculinity of Lear has been changed into femininity, as he will act on the basis of emotion than reason. This womanly behaviour of the king seems to evoke a further expansion or crossing of gender boundaries and positions, when Kent says to Gloucester, "I cannot conceive you.", Kent actually means that he does not understand him, but Gloucester picks up the sexual meaning:

Sir, this young fellow's
mother could....a son

For her cradle ere she had a
husband for her

Bed. (*King Lear* I.1.11-13)

Thus the possible reference to homosexuality is quickly suppressed and subverted into heterosexual framework. A heterosexist culture enforces 'compulsory heterosexuality', a term used by Adrienne Rich, among others, to describe the enormous pressure of to be heterosexual placed on young people by their families, schools, the church, and all forms of the media.

The manufacturing of heterosexuality is further strengthening by the enactment of the Dowry scene, a culture that in its religion and law, is hostile to such homosexual acts as "Sodomy". There is no doubt that discursive framework which defined sex and gender solely on the basis of binary categorisations have been powerful in shaping culture and subjectivity and the legacy of the uncontested homo-hetero bifurcation was powerful during the Elizabethan period. In the very beginning of the play Lear is committed to heterosexual relationships. Lear has already decided upon the division of his kingdom among his daughters, he has settled their marriages and he has marked the territories to be allowed to them on the map. Therefore, King Lear is a believer of heterosexual marriages and he is ready to

express his “darker purpose”. Lear’s abdication scene provides a paradigm of his power and rashness. He offers money and property in exchange of words of love:

Which of you shall we say
doth love us

Most.\ That we our largest
bounty may extend

Where nature doth with merit
challenge. (*King Lear* I.1.45-48)

As king Lear is the source of all money and property in their dependence on him. At this point the daughters resemble wives in a patriarchal marriage who can get money only by begging it from their husbands. Although Lear is emphasizing “heterosexuality”, which is dangerous as while it would seem to assure a man’s identity as a male, it leaves the man dependant on female for certification. Rather than be an identity, heterosexuality consists of a relation or an exchange, whereby male masculinity is confirmed by its other, the feminine, submissive and passive women. Cordelia’s “Nothing” in response to Lear’s childish demands for tokens of affection exemplifies the dilemma:

Unhappy that I am, I
cannot heave

My heart into my mouth: I
love your

Majesty\ According to my
bond, no more

No less. (*King Lear* I.1.86-88)

Thus, Cordelia’s resistance to her father indicates a somewhat lesbian suggestion. But Lear,s rage seems unreasonable in that he recognises only his rights as a father. He strongly rejects Cordelia’s “Nothing” by arguing, “Nothing will come of nothing” (*King Lear* I.I.85). Lear, in wishing to “unburdened crawl toward death”, wants to become a child, still omnipotent in his ability to control Cordelia’s “kind nursery”. In the love contest he pretends to have more power over his daughters’ feelings than he really has, and this of course, results in the loss of power that makes a split between his wishes. Although there is somewhat homo-social tone in Cordelia’s resistance, it is ultimately overshadowed by “compulsory heterosexuality”. By the end of the scene, Cordelia is reabsorbed into a patriarchal family by marriage. As she reassures the king of France:

It is no vicious blot,
murder of foulness,

No unchaste action or
dishonoured step that

Hath deprived me of
your grace and favour.

(*King Lear* I.1.222-224)

In order to avoid this kind of erasure and to promote solidarity among women, some lesbian critics have suggested that lesbian identity is not restricted to the sexual domain of but consists of directing the bulk of one's attention and emotional energy to other women as one's primary source of emotional sustenance and psychological support. That is, a lesbian is a woman-identified woman and Adrienne Rich calls it a 'lesbian continuum':

A lesbian continuum
includes a woman-identified experience,

Not simply the fact that a
woman has had or consciously desired

Genital sexual experience
with another woman. (Tyson 325)

Goneril's and Regan's treatment of their father merely reverses the existing patterns of heterosexuality, and selfish but as a fundamental violation of human society. Regan says to Lear----"I pray you, father, being weak, seem so..." (*King Lear* II.4.196), again Goneril says-----"I must change names at home, and give the

distaff\ Into my husband's hands." (*King Lear* IV.2.17-18), suggests that they are trying to go beyond the gender boundaries. Goneril, with proud vanity strikes against the heterosexual norms of marriages as she thinks that her husband Duke of Albany is actually a fool, who usurps her body. She even calls him a coward:

Milk-livered man

That bear'st a cheek for
blows, a head for

Wrongs;..../Thine
honour.....suffering. (*King Lear* IV.2.32-36)

In her attempt to achieve appropriate masculine virtue, Goneril resembles Elizabeth I, who had also attempted to reinforce her power by negating her femininity. She could only secure her status as a ruler by transcending the limitations of her sex: "I know I have the body of a weak feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a king." As a result of these increasing elements of masculinity in his daughters, King Lear gradually becomes 'feminised'. Perhaps Lear is also aware of his turning into a woman, as Lear appeals to God:

Touch me with noble
anger,

And let not women's
weapons, water drops

Stain my man's cheeks.
(*King Lear* II.4.269-271)

Lear becomes emasculated, infanticised and feminized. Lear's body slowly devolves into an odoriferous feminine body, not the redemptive balm of Cordelia, but the pathogenic bodies of Goneril and Regan. Lear even criticises Goneril for shaking his manhood and changing him into a woman:

I am ashamed/That thou
hast power to shake

My manhood thus,/That
these not tears, which

Break from me
perforce,/Should make thee

Worth them. (*King Lear*
II.4.251-254)

Suffering from the pangs of ingratitude, the angry king becomes sceptic about heterosexual relationships between men and women, which bore such 'unnatural hag' and 'detested kite' like Goneril and Regan respectively. Childbearing is an inseparable part of heterosexuality and Lear curses Goneril:

Dry up in her the organs
of increase....A babe

To honour her....be a
thwart disnatured torment

To her. (*King Lear*
I.4.235-240)

But this apparent possibility of Lear's support to homosexuality is again suppressed by compulsory heterosexuality as Lear still retains his faith on heterosexual relationships that produce such angelic daughter like Cordelia. Lear realisation of the complete and myriads power of the feminine body and its olfactory effects on the masculine state comes too late. Downing the feminine body, Lear finds the redemptive aromas of the feminine in Cordelia but too late.

In an important sense the Fool is less an alter-ego for his daughters, like them he reminds Lear about the change in his sex as well as his power. However, where the daughters exploit Lear's powerlessness with cruelty and oppression, he denies that necessity by his continued allegiance. It is as if Shakespeare using him as a means to heighten the emotional impact of Lear's decline. Lear's feminisation could be also connected with the "drag" culture, it is a way of refusing to be intimidated by heterosexist gender boundaries and a way

of getting all of us to think about our own sexuality by challenging gender roles. In *Gender Trouble* Butler argues that drag is not confined to gay and lesbian rituals or queer cultures. Drag is not understood as a secondary imitation or enactment of a prior, original gender. Rather, heterosexuality is itself part of a repeated effort to imitate its own idealisations. At the limit where the heterosexual male meet with heterosexual female, there is always a margin of error where something needed, can be lacking, where a required repetition that confirms by recognising fails to occur. The Fool reminds Lear several times, without heterosexual confirmation, Lear himself is nothing----“an O without a figure”, which clearly indicates that Lear is a woman:

Thou wast a pretty fellow
when thou

Hadst no need to care for
her frowning

Now thou art an O
without a figure. (*King Lear* I.4.150-152)

Again the Fool has compared the division of Lear with the breaking of an egg into two ends or crowns:

Why, after I have cut the
egg i'th middle

And eat up the meat, the
crowns of the

Egg....thou bear'st thine
ass on thy back

O'er the dirt. (*King Lear*
I.4.122-125)

Here the word ‘ass’ refers to servant rather than any animal. Because servants were known to be used sexually by their masters in Renaissance England, which also suggests the adoption of a submissive sexual posture in regard to someone more powerful, someone who would be quite literally on Lear’s back.

Edgar’s character is markedly heterosexual with a misogynistic attitude. He does not even talk about women, all he talks about why one should avoid them. His misogynistic attitude protects him against possible feminisation, which is already undergoes by Lear. Edgar’s martial power, his capacity for violence, leaves him immune to feminisation. He is not dependent on women for heterosexual confirmation because his aggression enacts a successful separation from the feminine and it is evident with the fact that he has no conversations with aggression, which also distinguishes him from the old king. Edgar threatens Edmund:

....Thy valour and thy
heart, thou art a traitor

Fells to thy gods, thy
brother, and thy father...

A most toad-spotted
traitor. (*King Lear* V.3.123-127)

Edgar's repeated warnings against heterosexual attachments during his mad speeches align him with the sodomites or homosexuals. Edgar, in the guise of the Bedlam beggar, possesses pious and optimistic faith in the goodness of the world and the justice of the gods, in his youthful, romantic vision of his role in this world of conflict. Edgar warns Lear against committing adultery with a woman, who is already married to another man and has shown loyalty to him:

Take head O'th'foul
fiend, obey thy parents,

Keep thy words' justice,
swear not, commit not

With man's sworn
spouse, set not thy sweet heart

On proud array. (*King
Lear* III.4.73-75)

Edgar considers his present
madness as the result of his heterosexual
relationships with his mistress. He has

satisfied his mistress's lustful desires and
duly performed sexual intercourse with her
in the darkness of the night. Again he used
to keep many mistresses than even the
sultan of Turkey. But now Tom O'Bedlam
is aware of his fault, now he recognizes the
dangers of heterosexuality. He advises
Lear not to give his poor heart to a woman
or rather to a prostitute in the brothel:

Let not creaking of shoes
nor the rustling

Of silks betray thy poor
heart out of plackets,

Thy pen from lender's
books, and defy the foul

Fiend. (*King Lear* III.4.85-
88)

Edgar's indulgence to homosexuality lends
some kind of effects in Lear, as he feels
sympathy for this "unaccommodated man".
He is now in love with that madness and is
eager to transform his sophisticated or
aristocratic status into such "a poor, bare,
forked animal" like Edger. Lear shed his
clothes and joins Edger in nakedness:

Unaccommodated man is no
more but such

A poor, bare, forked animal
as thou art. Off,

Off, you lendings! Come
unbutton here. (*King Lear* III.4.95-97)

The visual display of the scene evokes homosexuality. It is as if naked Lear invites naked Edgar to indulge in sexual intercourse. Unlike lesbian criticism gay criticism doesn't tend to focus on efforts to define homosexuality. Sexual relation between men, or even just the sexual desire of one man for another, is the general criterion of gayness:

The mere fact of sexual
desire for another man doesn't

Indicate that the man is
homosexual...only men who allowed

Themselves to be penetrated
by a man during sex and behaved

In a traditionally feminine
manner---submissive, coy, flirtatious,

“Soft”---were considered
homosexual. (Tyson 329)

Again Edgar's vocabulary also associates him with the sodomites or the homosexuals. Sodomites were often linked to witches, grotesque phenomena and evil spells, and Edgar's mad speeches are full of such images:

This is the foul
flibbertigibbet; he begins

Curfew and walks till the
first cock. He gives

The web and the pin, squints
the eye, and

Makes the harelip; mildews
the white wheat,

And hurts the poor creature
of earth. (*King Lear* III.4.102-105)

Lear's affectionate attachment with the Bedlam beggar is becoming stronger as he refuses to go away from the company of the 'learned Theban'. His characterisation of Edgar as an 'Athenian' slyly situates their encounter within the homoerotic Greek tradition of masters and pupils. Lear adopts a student's posture in keeping with the prevailing image of homosexuality at the time as a relationship between an older man and a younger one or 'Ganymede'.

In the disguise of Tom O'Bedlam, Edgar also undergoes with Lear, the experience of feminisation. He and Lear are naked in the storm together, and Edgar's fiend or devil is also associated with water:

Frateretto calls me, and tells
me Nero

Is an angler in the lake of
darkness. Pray,

Innocent, and beware the
foul fiend. (*King Lear* III.6.6-7)

In this following lines the emperor Nero is called are fiend and is associated with incest. Angling, is a term for sexual penetration, and 'darkness' is related to the vagina. The reference to Nero also evokes Nero's other crimes----having his mother dissected so that he could see her womb. Thus Edgar seems to warn against the incestuous desire of which Lear has been guilty. This also refers to the way of escape out of the water into which women dissolve men when they destroy their masculinity, a violent aggression that desexualises women. Lear's feminisation begins with the removal of his rank, crown and wet rags, Lear's body is now the feminine grotesque body, penetrated by water and stinking of every corruptible and feminine stench. Adelman writes on the androgynous nature of the storm:

The storm is at first
male (the thunder god), but also

Feminine (a witch's
storm), but in her estimation, the

Very wetness of the
storm comes to be a sexual wetness.

(Adelman 112)

If the phallic daughters feminize Lear, depriving him of power, and transforming him into a sexual servant, Lear discovers in Kent someone who subordinates himself to king Lear's will. In act-III, scene 4, when Lear asks Kent, "what do thou profess? What wouldst thou with us?", he replies that his job is to serve faithfully the man who puts his trust in him, to love him who is honest, to associate with him who is wise and speaks little. Again when Lear asks him "what art thou?", Kent introduces him as "a very honest hearted fellow, and as poor as the king." At the same time when Lear asks him "what wouldst thou?", Kent replies, "service". The word service has different interpretations throughout the play; it is dual in nature-----1) obedient service and 2) sexual service. In isomale relationships, the feminized heterosexual male can be repositioned in a dominant masculine posture if he receives "service" from another male. In a heterosexist culture gay sensibility includes an awareness of being different from the members of the mainstream, dominant culture and the complex feelings that result from an implicit, ongoing social oppression. In other words, part of seeing the world as a gay man includes the ways in which one deals with being oppressed as a homosexual. For this reason Lear feels

interested about Kent and he even asks Kent's age. Kent replies:

Not so young, sir to
love a woman for singing,

Nor so old to dote on
her for anything. I have

Tears on my back
forty-eight. (*King Lear* I.4.34-35)

This speech of Kent is endowed with homosexual tone and suggests that Kent is against the heterosexual relationships between man and woman.

Like Edgar, Kent is also misogynistic in his attitude towards a woman, which helps him to protect himself from the touch of feminization. Kent is also violent and aggressive in his approach towards Oswald. Like the sodomites or the homosexuals, Kent also uses many grotesque terms while criticising or challenging the servant:

A knave, a rascal, and
eater of broken meats,

A base, proud, shallow,
beggarly, three suited,

Hundred-pound, filthy
worsted stocking knave..

(*King Lear* II.2.13-15)

Kent even calls himself a dog as he tells Regan-----“I were your father's dog.” Such comments affirm the suspected homosexual undertones in Kent's service to Lear. But the compulsory heterosexuality is manifested strongly against such homosexual relationship between Lear and Kent. Lear is also aware of the service of Kent and finds him imprisoned into the stocks. Perhaps Lear finds his Fool in Kent, Kent's devotion for him reminds him about the Fool. Thus Lear is defying heterosexuality by allowing Kent's 'service':

Follow me; thou shalt
serve me, if I like

Thee no worse after
dinner. (*King Lear* I.4.36-37)

Lear's attachment with Kent and Edgar, also turns him misogynistic in his attitude to female sexuality. But although Lear has embraced the feminine smells of cold, wet, diseased femaleness, he still rails against as he addresses many scathing invectives towards the species of women and their corrupted body. In Act-IV, scene 5, Lear comments that a woman pretends to be a shy and virtuous maiden, a chaste, devoid of passion. But actually she has uncontrollable sexual desires and she enjoys sexual intercourse without least restraint. Even a prostitute or a well-fed

horse, bursting with sexual energy does not have so much enthusiasm for sexual pleasures as this woman has. In fact, Lear believes that from the middle of their bodies downwards, all women are bestial like horses; and they are women only from the middle of their bodies upwards. There is an indication of homosexual or same-sex desire of Lear in his hateful arguments about female organ:

Down from the waist they're
centaurs

Though women all above. But
to the girdle

Do the gods inherit; beneath is
all the fiend's.

There's hell, there's darkness,
there is the sulphurous

Pit, burning, scalding, stench,
consumption.

(*King Lear* IV.5.120-125)

Lear's phallogocentric comments about female organ and sexuality suggests his vanity for his male organ. This vanity helps Lear to reclaim his masculinity from the clutch of feminisation, as he is now proud of his kingship-----"Ay every inch a king" (*King Lear* IV.5.103). But although there is certain homosexual touch in Lear's misogynistic comments, he still retains his

faith in heterosexual relationships between men and women, as he supports adultery:

Die for adultery?

No, the wren goes to't,
and the small

Gilded fly/ Does lecher in
my sight

Let copulation thrive: for
Gloucester's

Bastard son/ was kinder
to his father

Than my
daughters.....(*King Lear* IV.5.106-111)

Thus, Edmund's gratitude to Gloucester helps Lear to still believe in compulsory heterosexuality, but ironically Edmund is actually a Machiavellian villain. The ending of the play is noteworthy for its emotionality. If women have been like men in the play, men now become like women, as Kent informs Lear----"Nor no man else. All's cheerless, dark, and deadly...And desperately are dead"(*King Lear* V.3. 264-66). In the final scene, Lear carries the hanged Cordelia, instead denouncing female effluvia whether emanating from Goneril and Regan, Mother Nature and his own body, Lear is searching frantically for the redemptive aromas which no longer emanates from his

daughter's lips. During the Elizabethan period all forms of non-procreative sex were forbidden by the church or state but they weren't viewed as evidence of a specific sexual identity. Danielle Naglar reads Lear's "smell of mortality as the smell of truth which incorporates the smell of man...If Lear now realizes his own inextricable place in the continuum of the feminine odours, can no longer find Cordelia's essence there and he must also die because his own essence is lost" (Naglar 59)

Shakespeare situated his works at the threshold of civility that bothered many and broadened social norms; it is something extraordinary when the works has been looked through the lens of queer analysis. The historically perverted misnomer homosexuality pulled at something momentous in Shakespeare, something that had important things to say about sexualities and their relationship with history and interpretation. Shakespeare through the same-sex eroticism in his works especially I have found in *King Lear*, representing the limits of social representation of sexuality in renaissance. We know Edgar to love men, yet he must, like James I, stand up in a public forum at the end and pretend to submit to the rules of compulsory heterosexuality. The anti-sodomy laws in

the religious culture could not tolerate gay coupling. Only in such enclaves as the theatre and the court was a gay sub-culture possible because only under the assumed roles men could act out their love for each other. The tragedy of *King Lear* is in part, that of compulsory heterosexuality, which must reform itself. But the homosexual men must live out of the form of compulsory heterosexuality, yet they must remain silent. Thus *King Lear* has proved that homosexuality is queered into being and that queer criticism reads texts to reveal the problematic quality of their representations of sexual categories homosexual and heterosexual break down, overlap, or do not adequately represent the dynamic range of human sexuality.

References

- Sinfield, Alan. *Cultural Politics: Queer Reading*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Sullivan, Nikki. *A Critical Introduction to Queer Theory*. New York: New York UP, 2003.
- Newman, Karen. *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama*. Chicago UP, 1991.
- Traub, Valerie. *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean*

drama. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Loomba, Ania. *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*. Delhi: Oxford UP, 1993.

Smith, R. Bruce. *Homosexual Desires in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural*

Poetics. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1995.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of King Lear*. Ed. Jay L. Halio. New Delhi: Cambridge UP, 2008.

Novy, Marianne. "Patriarchy, Mutuality, and Forgiveness". *Modern Critical*

Interpretations of King Lear. Ed. Harold Bloom. New Delhi: Viva Books, 2011.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User Friendly Guide*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Adelman, Janet. *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays,*

Hamlet to Tempest. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Naglar, Danielle. *Towards the Smell of Mortality: Shakespeare and Ideas of Smell*

1588-1625, Cambridge Quarterly, 1997.

Declaration

It is an original work by me and has not been published anywhere else for publication.

Bio-note

Name: Bidhan Mondal

Designation: M.A., B.ed & NET-JRF

Institution: Burdwan University

Specialisation: Literary Theory

Address: Bolpur, Nichupatti, Anandapally, P.O.Bolpur, Dist-Birbhum, Pin-731204

E-mail **id:**
bidhan.mondal.eng@gmail.com